



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/004,040	01/07/1998	LOVELL BRENT IVIE	T2701.DIV	9760

20451 7590 08/09/2004

GRANT R CLAYTON
CLAYTON HOWARTH & CANNON, PC
P O BOX 1909
SANDY, UT 84091-1909

EXAMINER

SRIVASTAVA, VIVEK

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/004,040

Applicant(s)

IVIE ET AL.

Examiner

Vivek Srivastava

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 25-56 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

(1) Applicant's, in regards to claim 36, invoke 35 U.S.C. sixth paragraph arguing that dissemination means is expressed as a means plus function. Applicant's further provide a three-prong process in support. In the first prong, Applicant's argue that a function is being performed by the dissemination means to selectively convey information signals. In the second prong, Applicant's argue the structure disclosed in the specification, and in particular cite figures 2A, 2B, 3, 4, 4A, 4B and 4C stating that these figures are all illustrations of a dissemination means. Applicant's further provide, for each figure, a descriptive structure of the figure.

The Examiner respectfully submits, although Applicant's correctly identified and met the first prong of the process, Applicant's fail to meet the second prong of the process. After carefully reviewing Applicants figures and cited portions in the specification, the Examiner asserts that the dissemination means is not supported by the specification as required by 35 U.S.C. 6th paragraph. The MPEP requires that the corresponding structure of a means-plus-function limitation must be disclosed in the specification itself in a way that one skilled in the art will understand what structure will perform the recited function. The specification does not disclose adequate structure, material or acts for performing the recited function. Although figures 2A, 2B, 3, 4, 4A, 4B and 4C (and the corresponding written disclosure) discloses disseminating

Art Unit: 2611

information, figures 2A, 2B, 3, 4, 4A, 4B and 4C is defined as a "man-made structure" (see page 16 lines 5-6) and not a dissemination means. In other words, the specification fails to clearly support a dissemination means. Applicant's argue the structure of the alleged dissemination means on pages 18 – 20 of the response. However, as discussed above the structure of the dissemination means is not supported in the specification.

(2) Applicant's argue, on page 21, Gutenson, nor any of the art now of record in this application, teaches a coaxial connector, a twisted pair connector and fiber optic connector mounted on single panel of the distribution box.

The Examiner concurs. However, in the previous office action and reiterated below, it would have been obvious to modify Gutenson to include this feature.

(3) Applicant's argue Gutenson does not disclose or suggest the use of an optional telephone system control box containing a telephone control system. Moreover, Gutenson does not disclose or suggest the use of a box mounted into a wall cavity as is present in another embodiment of the present invention.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., box mounted into a wall cavity) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification

Art Unit: 2611

are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

(4) Applicant's argue Gutenson does not disclose the dissemination means of claim 41. Further, as argue above, Applicant's provide a three-pronged analysis for invoking 35 U.S.C. 6th paragraph.

Since this is a redundant argument, the Examiner directs Applicant's to the response provided above.

(5) Applicant's argue that the since the splitter does not have the same structure or function as the claimed dissemination means, there can be no anticipation on this element.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Once again, since the structure of the claimed dissemination means is not supported or provided in the specification, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

(6) Applicant argues that Gutenson fails to disclose a set of connectors mounted together on a panel which also constitutes part of the claimed dissemination means.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Since the specification fails to particularly support a dissemination means with connectors mounted together on a panel, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

(7) Applicant argues, for claim 25, that Gutenson teaches away from the invention in claim 25 since it would have been pointless to modify Gutenson to include a first, second and third set of connectors at the central location. Further Applicant's argue that Gutenson fails to teach or suggest a support means having a plurality of sets of connectors connected thereon.

The Examiner respectfully submits that just because Applicant's feel it is "pointless" to modify Gutenson does not mean that Gutenson teaches away from the claimed invention. The Examiner urges Applicant's in the subsequent response to point out portions of Gutenson which specifically teach away from the modification. The Examiner concurs with Applicant's statement that Gutenson fails to teach a support means having a plurality of sets of connectors. Referring back to the previous office action, the Examiner stated that this feature was not anticipated and that it would have been obvious to modify Gutenson to include this limitation. As result, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

(8) Applicant argues, for claim 45, the Johnson does not qualify as prior art because of the filing date of Johnson is after that of Applicant's invention.

The Examiner concurs and regrets this oversight. As result, this rejection is made non-final.

Art Unit: 2611

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 41 and 44, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gutenson et al (5,043,531).

Considering claim 41, Gutenson discloses a data communication system within a home (col 3 lines 4-17) comprising a first room, a second room and a third room (see col 3 lines 3-7 and fig 2), a central location (met by location comprising splitter 80 in fig 2), a service center 32 for entering data into the home (see col 3 lines 8 – 17) which conveys information to the central location for distribution throughout the structure. Gutenson further discloses a coaxial gateway 56 which amplifies the signal transmitted to the splitter 80 (see col 3 lines 36 – 40), the amplifier in the coaxial gateway meets the claimed “first electronic circuit” limitation. Gutenson discloses a first bus (met by cable 52D in fig 2) which extends from the central location to a first room; Note the bus or cable comprises a coaxial cable, a plurality of twisted wires and a fiber optic cable (see col 4 lines 58-61). Gutenson discloses a second bus (met by cable 52E in fig 2) which extends from central location to a second room; Note the bus or cable comprises a

Art Unit: 2611

coaxial cable, a plurality of twisted wires and a fiber optic cable (see col 4 lines 58-61). Gutenson discloses a third bus (met by cable 52F in fig 2) which extends from central location to a third room; Note the bus or cable comprises a coaxial cable, a plurality of twisted wires and a fiber optic cable (see col 4 lines 58-61). Further, Gutenson discloses splitter 80 within central location (dissemination means is within splitter 80 for splitting signals, see col 5 lines 33-44) for selectively conveying any electronic information present on the first electronic circuit to and of the first, second or third busses.

Considering claim 44, Gutenson discloses splitter 80 (which meets the claimed dissemination means as discussed above) comprising coaxial cables 54 (see col 5 lines 44 – 50). Gutenson also inherently discloses connectors attached to each of the length of cable to couple or connect the coaxial cable in splitter 80 with the coaxial cable in service center 32 or to various taps and outlets 82 within the home (see fig 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2611

Claims 25 – 29, 31 – 35, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gutenson et al (5,043,531).

Considering claim 25, Gutenson discloses a system for distributing television signals and telephone signals in a first room, second room and third room within a home (see fig 2 and col 3 lines 7-17) noting that the television and telephone signals meets the claimed “electronic information signals” limitation. Gutenson further discloses a communications cable comprising twisted wire pairs, coaxial cables and optical fiber (see col 4 lines 59-61). Gutenson also inherently discloses a first input means for receiving a first information signal (first input means met by inputting telephone or television signals into the system, see col 3 lines 7-17). Gutenson also inherently discloses an interconnection means for communicating the electronic information signals on the first input means to any of the first, second or third rooms (since rooms are interconnected for distributing information, Gutenson discloses the claimed limitation). Further, Gutenson discloses a interconnection means (met by service center 32 – see fig 2) located at a “central location” and allowing any of the electronic information signals to be selectively conveyed to only one of the first, second or third rooms in the structure such that the electronic information signals may be conveyed to only one of the first, second or third rooms in the structure of a plurality of rooms in the structure (see fig 2).

Gutenson fails to disclose the claimed support means for holding a plurality of connectors, said support means comprising a panel, said panel having at least some of the plurality of connectors mounted thereon, a first set of connectors connected to the

Art Unit: 2611

support means, a second set of connectors connected to the support means and a third set of connectors connected to the support means, wherein each set of connectors include a coaxial cable connector, an optical fiber connector and a twisted pair connector for conveying information to the first, second or third rooms.

It would have been obvious providing connectors and support for the cables or wiring in Gutenson would provide connection and support required for distributing cables within a home. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gutenson to include the claimed connectors and support for the cables in Gutenson to enable secure distribution of cables and data within a home.

Considering claim 26, Gutenson discloses a service center 32 which is depicted as having a front panel and housing and which is depicted as being supported to the wall of the home for conveying signals to splitter 80 for distribution to rooms within the home (see fig 2).

Considering claim 27, Gutenson discloses a communications cable including a coaxial cable for distributing and receiving a first signal (see col 4 lines 51-62).

Considering claim 28, Gutenson discloses a communications cable including a optical fiber cable for distributing and receiving a first signal (see col 4 lines 51-62).

Considering claim 29, Gutenson discloses a communications cable including a twisted pair cable for distributing and receiving a first signal (see col 4 lines 51-62).

Regarding claim 31, Gutenson fails to disclose wherein the twisted pair connector comprises a CAT5 connector. It would have been obvious to one skilled in

the art to use a CAT5 connector in Gutenson since a CAT5 connector is a well known standard which would result in a connector which has been tested and known to be reliable.

Regarding claim 32, Gutenson fails to disclose the claimed wherein each of the first, second, third and fourth set of connectors each comprise two coaxial cable connectors, two optical fiber connectors and two twisted pair connectors.

Regarding claim 32, as discussed in claim 25, it would have been obvious to include the claimed first, second, third and fourth set of connectors. Gutenson further discloses the first, second, third and fourth buses comprise two coaxial cables, four twisted pair cables and one optical fiber (see fig 6A and 6B). It would have been obvious modifying Gutenson to include two twisted pair cables in lieu of four resulting in two twisted pair connectors would have provided a smaller communication cable resulting in less space consumed and less cost and it would have been obvious including another optical fiber thus having two total resulting in two optical fiber connectors would have enabled another communication medium for transmitting data signals. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gutenson to include the claimed connectors associated with coaxial cable, optical fiber and twisted pair cable to reduce space and cost and to provide another communication medium thus providing a greater amount of communication within a dwelling.

Considering claim 33, Gutenson inherently discloses the claimed "wherein the first interconnection means comprises a length of coaxial cable including a coaxial cable

Art Unit: 2611

connector positioned at each end thereof" since a connector must be included to connect the cable on each end to tap and splitter (see col 6 lines 43-50, connector would be required to 'connect' the end of the coaxial cable to the tap module and to splitter 80 in fig 2).

Considering claim 34, Gutenson inherently discloses the claimed "wherein the second interconnection means comprises a length of optical fiber including an optical fiber connector positioned at each end thereof" (see col 4 lines 51-62, connector would be required to 'connect' the end of the optical fiber cable to a tap, module or receiving device and to splitter 80 in fig. 2).

Considering claim 35, Gutenson inherently discloses the claimed "wherein the third interconnection means comprises a length of twisted pair cable including a twisted pair connector positioned at each end thereof" (see col 6 lines 43-50 and col 3 lines 28-35, connector would be required to 'connect' the end of the twisted pair to the telephone tap to splitter 80 in fig. 2).

Regarding claim 42, Gutenson discloses a telephone gateway 48 comprising twisted pair conductors 50 which transmits signals to twisted pair conductors 50 and RS 232 cable 49 (fig 3 and col 3 lines 29 – 35). It is noted that Gutenson discloses the claimed "third electronic information circuit" since input signals 8 are separated and directed to splitter 80 via twisted pair conductors 50 or to the control data communication system 60 via RS 232 cable 49 (see fig 3). Further, Gutenson discloses the claimed first electronic circuit as discussed above in claim 41 comprising coaxial cable (col 3 lines 36 – 40). Although Gutenson discloses optical fiber is also distributed

Art Unit: 2611

within the home, Gutenson fails to disclose the claimed second electronic information circuit entering the dwelling and conveying electronic information to the central location and the second electronic information circuit comprising optical fiber. It would have been obvious to modify Gutenson to include the claimed second electronic circuit comprising a optical fiber to enable optical fiber signals to be received from the outside and to be selected, switched and distributed to various locations within and home. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gutenson to include the claimed limitation to enable higher bandwidth better quality optical fiber signals to be received and to be selected, switched and distributed to desired locations within a home.

Regarding claim 43, Gutenson discloses the first, second, third and fourth buses comprise two coaxial cables, four twisted pair cables and one optical fiber (see fig 6A and 6B). It would have been obvious modifying Gutenson to include two twisted pair cables in lieu of four would have provided a smaller communication cable resulting in less space consumed and less cost and it would have been obvious including another optical fiber thus having two total in the first, second, third and fourth buses would have enabled another communication medium for transmitting data signals. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gutenson to include two twisted pairs in lieu of four to reduce space and cost and it would have been obvious including two optical fibers in lieu of just one to provide another communication medium thus providing a greater amount of

Claims 30 and 48 - 56 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gutenson in view of Applicant's disclosure.

Considering claim 30, Gutenson discloses a coaxial cable connector but fails to disclose the claimed coaxial cable connector comprises an RG6 connector. The Applicant's disclosure teaches that the RG6 connector is known industry standard (see page 21 lines 9 – 11). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Gutenson in view of the Applicant's disclosure to use the known RG6 connector to ensure use of a reliable connector which has been proven effective.

Considering claim 48, claim 48 recites some of the same limitations as recited in claim 36 and thus is met by that discussed in claim 36. Claim 48 further recites "set of information carrying media being capable of carrying telephone signals, television signals, radio frequency signals and light signals from first location to second location" which is met by Gutenson (see col 3 lines 13-17; note: roof antennas receive RF signals and optical signals are carried on the optical fiber – see col 4 lines 59-61).

Claim 48 further recites a distribution panel disposed at the first location (met by service center 32 – fig 3), however, Gutenson fails to disclose the distribution panel having at least one CAT5 connector, at least one optical fiber connector, and at least one RG6 coaxial cable connector, each of the of at least one twisted pair cable having a first end attached to one of the at least one CAT5 connector and each of the one coaxial cable having a first end attached to one of the at least one RG6 coaxial cable connector.

The Applicant's disclosure teaches that the RG6 connector is known industry standard (see page 21 lines 9 – 11). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Gutenson in view of the Applicant's disclosure to use the known RG6 connector to ensure use of a reliable connector which has been proven effective.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use a CAT5 connector in Gutenson since a CAT5 connector is a well known standard which would result in a connector which has been tested and known to be reliable.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having routine skill in the art to modify Gutenson to include the claimed RG6 connector and CAT5 connector to provide a connector which reliable and effective

Further, Gutenson fails to disclose the distribution panel comprises a fiber optic's connector and a fiber optic cable coupled to the connector. It would have been obvious to modify Gutenson to include the claimed fiber optic connector and fiber optic cable to enable optical fiber signals to be received from the outside and to be selected, switched and distributed to various locations within and home. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gutenson to include the claimed limitation to enable higher bandwidth better quality optical fiber signals to be received and to be selected, switched and distributed to desired locations within a home.

Regarding claim 49, Gutenson discloses four twisted pair cables. It would have been obvious modifying Gutenson to include two twisted pair cables in lieu of four would have provided a smaller communication cable resulting in less space consumed and

Art Unit: 2611

less cost. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gutenson to include two twisted pairs in lieu of four to reduce space and cost.

Regarding claim 50, Gutenson discloses one optical fiber. It would have been obvious including another optical fiber thus having two total would have enabled another communication medium for transmitting data signals. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Gutenson to include two optical fibers in lieu of just one to provide another communication medium thus providing a greater amount of communication within a dwelling.

Considering claim 51, Gutenson discloses the claimed wherein at least one coaxial cable comprises two coaxial cables (see col 4 lines 59-61).

Regarding claim 52, Gutenson discloses the first, second, third and fourth buses comprise two coaxial cables, four twisted pair cables and one optical fiber (see fig 6A and 6B). It would have been obvious modifying Gutenson to include two twisted pair cables in lieu of four in the set of information carrying media would have provided a smaller communication cable resulting in less space consumed and less cost and it would have been obvious including another optical fiber thus having two total in the set of information carrying media would have enabled another communication medium for transmitting data signals. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gutenson to include two twisted pairs in lieu of four to reduce space and cost and it would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2611

including two optical fibers in lieu of just one to provide another communication medium thus providing a greater amount of communication within a dwelling.

Considering claims 53, Gutenson discloses the claimed wherein the set of information carrying media has a bandwidth, said bandwidth being greater than a bandwidth of coaxial cable and bandwidth of a plurality of twisted pair cables (see col 4 lines 3-14, col 4 lines 51 – 65, optical cable has higher bandwidth than coax and twisted pair).

Regarding claims 54, 55 and 56 see claims 38, 39 and 40 above.

Claims 36 – 40 and 45 – 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gutenson in view of Humphrey et al (3,869,582).

Considering claim 36, Gutenson discloses conveying telephone and television information between rooms (i.e. a first location and second location, see col 3 lines 8-15 and fig 2) via a communications cable comprising a coaxial cable, and optical fiber cable and twisted pair cable (see col 4 lines 51-62). Gutenson also discloses the optical fiber, twisted pair and coaxial cable are bundled together such that the optical fiber cable, the coaxial cable and twisted pair cable form an elongated set of three cables which are maintained in parallel and which be bent during installation and use (see fig 6a, 6b, 6c and 6d and note in fig 2 that the cables are bent as they are distributed throughout the home). Further, Gutenson discloses splitter 80 within central location (dissemination means is within splitter 80 for splitting signals, see col 5 lines 33-44) for

Art Unit: 2611

selectively conveying any electronic information present on the first electronic circuit to and of the first, second or third busses.

Gutenson fails to disclose the claimed dissemination means comprising a at least one patch cable.

Humphrey teaches a patch cord on a cross-connect panel provides a convenient centralized location for networking the communications and data processing systems within a building and for interconnecting and switching telephone numbers a telephone jacks within a building (see col 4 lines 1-24 and col 5 lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Gutenson to include the claimed dissemination means including patch cord to flexibly interconnect and switch the dissemination means to the first, second or third bus.

Considering claim 37, Gutenson discloses the claimed wherein the coaxial cable extends from the first location to the second location (see fig 2).

Considering claim 38, Gutenson inherently discloses the claimed coaxial cable connector connected to an end of the coaxial cable at a second end (see col 6 lines 43-50, connector would be required to 'connect' the end of the coaxial cable to the tap module).

Considering claim 39, Gutenson inherently discloses the claimed twisted pair connector connected to an end of the twisted pair cable at a second end (see col 6 lines 43-50 and col 3 lines 28-35, connector would be required to 'connect' the end of the twisted pair to the telephone tap).

Art Unit: 2611

Considering claim 40, Gutenson inherently discloses the claimed fiber optic connector connected to an end of the optical fiber cable at a second end (see col 4 lines 51-62, connector would be required to 'connect' the end of the optical fiber cable to a tap, module or receiving device).

Considering claim 45, Gutenson discloses a central service center 32 which (see col 3 lines 10-15 and fig 3) comprises a plurality of groups of connectors (see fig 3), wherein connectors inherently couple coaxial cable 54 to coaxial gateway 56 and couple twisted wire pairs 50 to telephone gateway 48 (see fig 3). It is noted that the connectors connecting the coaxial cable and twisted wire pairs to the respective gateways provide distribution of signals to specific outlets 82 or 'locations' throughout the home in figure 2.

Gutenson fails to disclose the claimed patch cord. Humphrey teaches a patch cord on a cross-connect panel provides a convenient centralized location for networking the communications and data processing systems within a building and for interconnecting and switching telephone numbers a telephone jacks within a building (see col 4 lines 1-24 and col 5 lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Gutenson to include the claimed patch cord including a connector at a first end which is received by one of the group connectors, the patch cord second end connected to a service signal wherein the service signal can be switched from one location in the structure to another by disconnecting the patch cord from a connector in a first group and connecting it to another connector in a second group to provide a

Art Unit: 2611

convenient centralized location for networking the communications and data processing systems.

Considering claim 46, Gutenson discloses home structure which meets the claimed residence limitation (see Abstract).

Considering claim 47, Gutenson discloses the claimed telephone signals (see col 3 lines 29 – 30).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sass et al (5,418,878) – multi-mode communications cable

Brown (6,282,405) – hybrid telecommunications distribution network

Arroyo et al (5,745,627) – composite cable

Flickinger et al (5,901,340) – wideband signal distribution system

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872 - 9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

Art Unit: 2611

(703) 308- 5399 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivek Srivastava whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 4038.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andy Faile, can be reached at (703) 305 - 4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 3900.

VS

8/5/04



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER